UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/010,973	12/05/2001	Paul R. Nash	112076-138354	8414

25943   7590   04/07/2010

Schwabe Williamson & Wyatt
PACWEST CENTER, SUITE 1900
1211 SW FIFTH AVENUE
PORTLAND, OR 97204

EXAMINER
PHILLIPS, HASSAN A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2451	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
04/07/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *19 August 2009*.
2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.
3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1,2,4-8,10-20 and 22-67* is/are pending in the application.
　　4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6)☒ Claim(s) *1,2,4-8,10-20 and 22-67* is/are rejected.
7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.
　　Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
　　Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
　　a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:
　　　　1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
　　　　2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
　　　　3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
　　* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
　　Paper No(s)/Mail Date *8/19/09*.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
　　Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to communications filed August 19, 2009. Claims
1, 2, 4-8, 10-20, and 22-67 remain pending. Claims 1, 19, 35, 50 and 64-67 are
amended.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

2. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee
set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this
application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set
forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action
has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on July 13,
2009 has been entered.

Information Disclosure Statement

3. The information disclosure statement filed August 19, 2009 has been
received and considered by the examiner.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

4. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of
matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the
conditions and requirements of this title.

5. Claims 1, 2, 4-8, 10-18, 35-49, 67, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

6. In considering independent claims 1, 35, and 67, although the claims recite a method, the claims do not require that the method be implemented by a particular machine, nor do the claims require that the method particularly transform a particular article. Accordingly the claims are directed wholly to a judicial exception and do not fall within at least one of the four statutory categories of patent eligible subject matter recited in 35 U.S.C. 101.

Claims 2, 4-8, 10-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 based on their dependency to claim 1.

Claim 36-49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 based on their dependency to claim 35.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 2, 4-8, 10-20, and 22-67 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

8. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

9.   Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 10-20, 22, 23, 25-40, 42-54, 56-67 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Risley et al. (hereinafter Risley), U.S. Patent 6,332,158 (see IDS filed 8/19/09).

10. In considering claims 1, 19, 35, 50, and 64-67, Risley teaches an apparatus and method comprising: determining based at least in part on content of a locator (i.e. http://www.infosadsaseek.com/Home) of a first information page (i.e. temporary web page) requested to be retrieved and displayed on a client system, whether to provide information browsing assistance for the first information page (col. 11, line 63-col. 12, line 12), said determining including analyzing a pattern of the locator of the first information page to determine whether the locator satisfies a pre-specified locator pattern (i.e. misspelled URL) (col. 10, line 57-col. 11, line12), each pre-specified locator pattern identifying a plurality of additional locators (i.e. http://www.infoseek.com, http://www.altavista.digital.com) of a plurality of additional locations having additional complementary or related information that amplifies information of the first information page (col. 11, line 63-col. 12, line 12), the analyzing including comparing the locator pattern against a plurality of pre-specified locator patterns (i.e. correctly spelled URL's), (col. 10, line 57-col. 11, line12); and conditionally providing said information browsing

assistance based at least in part on said determination (col. 9, lines 49-52), the

information browsing assistance including all or a portion of the additional

complementary or related information, (col. 11, line 63-col. 12, line 12).

11. In considering claims 2, 20, 36, and 51 Risley teaches wherein said locator

comprises a uniform resource locator (URL), (col. 12, lines 3-5).

12. In considering claims 4 and 22, Risley teaches wherein said locator

comprises a uniform resource locator (URL), (col. 12, lines 3-5); said pre-specified

locator pattern is a pre-specified URL pattern, and said determining comprises

analyzing whether said URL satisfies the pre-specified URL pattern, (col. 10, line 57-col.

11, line12).

13. In considering claims 5, 23, and 54, Risley teaches wherein said pre-specified

URL pattern comprises a URL pattern abstracting a plurality of URLs of the plurality of

locations having information that amplifies the information of the first information page,

(col. 12, lines 5-7); and said analysis comprises matching said URL against a plurality of

URL patterns, (col. 10, line 57-col. 11, line12).

14. In considering claims 10 and 25, Risley further teaches wherein said

information browsing assistance comprises displaying a second information page (i.e.

banner 400), (col. 11, line 66-col. 12, line 1).

15. In considering claims 11, 26, 43, and 57, Risley further teaches wherein said second information page effectively replaces said first information page (i.e. the banner effectively replaces the temporary web page when clicked on by the user), (col. 11, lines 13-16).

16. In considering claims 12, 27, 44, and 58, the teachings of Risley teach wherein said second information page is additionally displayed complementing said first information page, (col. 11, line 63-col. 12, line 1).

17. In considering claims 13, 28, 45, and 59, Risley teaches said second information page comprises the additional locators and/or the additional information, (col. 11, lines 13-18).

18. In considering claims 14, 29, 46, and 60, Risley teaches wherein said information browsing assistance comprises modifying one or more environment attributes of the browsing environment within which said determining and conditional provision of information browsing assistance are performed, (col. 12, lines 13-20).

19. In considering claims 15, 30, 47, and 61, the teachings of Risley suggest wherein said one or more environment attributes comprising one or more of a display resolution attribute, a color resolution attribute, a font selection attribute, a media player

preference attribute, an add-on selection attribute, and a plug-in selection attribute, (col. 12, lines 13-20).

20. In considering claims 16 and 31, Risley teaches receiving a request to retrieve and display said first information page, said request including said locator, (col. 12, lines 3-5).

21. In considering claims 17, 32, 48, and 62, the teachings of Risley suggest in response to said receiving, notifying a monitor function of a browser helper of said receiving, (col. 9, line 49-col. 10, line 13); and said monitor function, in response to receipt of said notification, notifying an analyzer function of said browser helper, which performs said determining and conditional provision of information browsing assistance, (col. 10, line 49-col. 11, line 12).

22. In considering claims 18, 33, and 63, the teachings of Risley suggest executing said monitor function as an extension of a browser (col. 9, line 49-col. 10, line 13), and executing said analyzer function external to the browser, (col. 10, line 49-col. 11, line 12).

23. In considering claim 34, Risley teaches the apparatus being a selected one of a wireless telephone, a palm sized personal digital assistant, a notebook computer, a desktop computer, and a set top box, (col. 6, lines 32-49).

24. In considering claim 37, Risley teaches performing a selected one of (a) enabling the client system to determine whether the pre-specified locator pattern is met, and (b) enabling the client system to provide said locator to a server system (501) for the server system to determine for said client system whether the pre-specified locator pattern is met, (col. 10, line 49-col. 11, line 12).

25. In considering claim 38, Risley teaches the server system being the same server system performing the receiving and the responsive providing, (col. 10, line 49-col. 11, line 12).

26. In considering claim 39, Risley teaches wherein said locator comprises a URL (col. 12, lines 3-5) and said pre-specified locator pattern is a pre-specified URL pattern, (col. 10, line 57-col. 11, line12); and said executable instructions designed to perform a selected one of (a) to enable the client system to determine whether said URL satisfies the pre-specified URL pattern, and (b) enable the client system to provide said URL to a server system for the server system to determine for said client system whether the pre-specified locator pattern is met, (col. 10, line 57-col. 11, line12).

27. In considering claim 40, Risley teaches wherein said pre-specified URL pattern comprises a URL pattern abstracting a plurality of URLs of the plurality of locations having content that amplifies the information of the first information page, (col.

12, lines 5-7); and either (a) said executable instructions are designed to enable the

client system to match said URL against a plurality of URL patterns, or (b) the method

further comprises a server system matching said URL against a plurality of URL

patterns for said client system, (col. 10, line 57-col. 11, line12).

28. In considering claim 42, Risley further teaches either (a) said executable

instructions are designed to enable the client system to provide said information

browsing assistance by displaying a second information page, or (b) the method further

comprising a server system providing said information browsing assistance to said client

system by causing a second information page to be displayed on said client system,

(col. 11, line 66-col. 12, line 1).

29. In considering claim 49, the teachings of Risley further suggest wherein either

(a) said browser helper further includes said analyzer function to perform said

conditional provision of information browsing assistance, in response to receipt of said

notification, or (b) the method further includes a server having said analyzer function to

perform said conditional provision of information browsing assistance for said client

system, in response to receipt of said notification from said client system, (col. 10, line

49-col. 11, line 12).

30. In considering claim 52, Risley teaches wherein said first executable

instructions designed to (a) enable the client system to determine whether the pre-

specified locator pattern is met, or (b) request that the server system determine for said

client system whether the pre-specified locator pattern is met, (col. 10, line 49-col. 11,

line 12).

31. In considering claim 53, Risley teaches wherein said locator comprises a URL

(col. 12, lines 3-5), and said pre-specified locator pattern is a pre-specified URL pattern,

(col. 10, line 57-col. 11, line12).

32. In considering claim 56, Risley further teaches wherein said first executable

instructions designed to enable the client system to provide said information browsing

assistance include instructions designed to enable the client system to display a second

information page, (col. 11, line 66-col. 12, line 1).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

33. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

34. Claims 6, 24, 41, 55, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Risley in view of Cohen et al. (hereinafter Cohen), U.S. patent

6,654,741.

35. In considering claims 6, 24, 41, and 55, although the teachings Risley disclose substantial features of the claimed invention, they fail to expressly disclose: each URL pattern comprises a plurality of portions correspondingly stored in a plurality of nodes of a tree data structure, with the plurality of nodes having a child leaf node specifying information browsing assistance to be provided; and said matching comprises traversing said tree data structure.

Nevertheless, in analogous teachings, Cohen discloses each URL pattern comprising a plurality of portions correspondingly stored in a plurality of nodes of a tree data structure, with the plurality of nodes having a child leaf node specifying information browsing assistance to be provided, (col. 6, lines 9-28); and said matching comprises traversing said tree data structure, (col. 6, .lines 9-28).

Thus, given the teachings of Cohen, one of ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to modify the teachings of Risley to expressly disclose each URL pattern comprises a plurality of portions correspondingly stored in a plurality of nodes of a tree data structure, with the plurality of nodes having a child leaf node specifying information browsing assistance to be provided; and said matching comprises traversing said tree data structure. Doing so would have advantageously provided a flexible, convenient, and dynamic system and method for mapping an incorrect URL to the temporary web page that includes the possibly correct URL's, (Cohen, col. 1, line 66-col. 2, line 6, Risley, col. 5, lines 1-26).

36. Claim 7, is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Risley

in view of Cohen, and further in view of Lyons et al. (hereinafter Lyons), U.S. Patent

6,094,665.

37. In considering claim 7, although the modified teachings Risley disclose

substantial features of the claimed invention, they further fail to expressly disclose:

downloading said tree data structure from a server system onto said client system.

38. Nevertheless, in analogous teachings, Lyons discloses correcting URL

patterns at a client system, (col. 4, line 59-col. 5, line 2).

Thus, given the teachings of Lyons, one of ordinary skill in the art would have

found it obvious to further modify the teachings of Risley to expressly disclose

downloading said tree data structure from a server system onto said client system.

Doing so would have advantageously provided a flexible, convenient, and dynamic

system and method for mapping an incorrect URL to a temporary web page that

includes the possibly correct URL's, at the client system, (Cohen, col. 1, line 66-col. 2,

line 6, Risley, col. 5, lines 1-26, Lyons, col. 4, line 59-col. 5, line 2).

39. Claim 8, is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Risley

in view of Lyons.

40. In considering claim 8, although the teachings Risley disclose substantial

features of the claimed invention, they further fail to expressly disclose: downloading

said URL patterns and their corresponding information browsing assistance

specifications from a server system onto said client system.

Nevertheless, in analogous teachings, Lyons discloses correcting URL patterns

at a client system, (col. 4, line 59-col. 5, line 2).

Thus, given the teachings of Lyons, one of ordinary skill in the art would have

found it obvious to further modify the teachings of Risley to expressly disclose

downloading said URL patterns and their corresponding information browsing

assistance specifications from a server system onto said client system. Doing so would

have advantageously provided a flexible, convenient, and dynamic system and method

for mapping an incorrect URL to a temporary web page that includes the possibly

correct URL's, at the client system, (Risley, col. 5, lines 1-26, Lyons, col. 4, line 59-col.

5, line 2).

Conclusion

41. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to

applicant's disclosure. Please see PTO form 892.

42. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from

the examiner should be directed to HASSAN PHILLIPS whose telephone number is

(571)272-3940. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri (9am-6pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on 571-272-3964. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Hassan Phillips/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2451